



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,614	12/12/2003	Jean Renard Ward	38820-545F01US	1705
30623 7590 08/24/2009 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111				
EXAMINER TURCHEN, JAMES R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2439				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/24/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/734,614

Applicant(s)

WARD, JEAN RENARD

Examiner

JAMES TURCHEN

Art Unit

2439

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-16 and 18-28 are pending. Claims 1, 15, 21 and 27 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 and 18-28 regarding the newly added subject matter have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 05/11/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant regarding what Chen discloses is not a record of fabrication. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the fabrication details discussed in paragraph 48) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, paragraph 48 states, "fabrication details is **broadly defined to include, e.g.** equipment used in document fabrication..." There is nothing that particularly excludes an "issue identification number" from being a fabrication detail. The inclusion of "equipment used in document fabrication, a fabrication operator, a distribution channel, inventory details, and a fabrication completion date" within the claim would further prosecution.

Claim Objections

Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: The word comprising should be added to "the identification document a security feature" as recited in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al. (US 6,292,092) in view of Chen et al. (US 5,694,471) and Xu et al. (US 7,028,902).

Regarding claims 1 and 5:

Chow et al. discloses an identification document comprising a photographic representation of a bearer of the identification document (figure 2, item 2) and indicia provided on the document (figure 2, item 1), the identification document further comprising a security feature printed on a surface of the identification document in a two-dimensional encoded symbology (figure 2, item 3), the security feature including: a first set of information corresponding to at least one of the identification document, the bearer of the identification document (figure 2, item 1 shows the bearers information in plain text) and an issuer of the identification document (figure 2, examiner interprets the Canadian flag as an identification of the issuer), wherein the first set of information comprises an unencrypted form; and a cryptographic measure associated with the first set of information (column 4 lines 62-67). Chow et al does not disclose the cryptographic measure identifying at least a record of fabrication for the identification document. Chen et al. discloses an issuer identification number (column 7 lines 37-48)

that is used in a public/private key pair (column 8 lines 9-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the identification document disclosed by Chow et al. with the record of fabrication used in the cryptographic measure in order identify who issued the document.

Chow et al. and Chen et al. do not disclose that the first set of information or the cryptographic measure are contained in the encoded symbology. Xu et al. discloses that a two-dimensional barcode (encoded symbology) can embed a variety of data such as a signature, an identification code, a URL, encrypted or unencrypted data, and a logo and other graphics [column 3 lines 27-49]. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Regarding claim 2:

Chow et al., Chen et al. and Xu et al. disclose the identification document of claim 1, wherein the record of fabrication identifies at least one of equipment used in fabricating the identification document, an identification document assembler, a distribution channel and an operator of document fabrication equipment (Chen et al. discloses the issuer identification number. It is inherent that the issuer identification number discloses the operator of document equipment (either an individual or organization)).

Regarding claim 3:

Chow et al. discloses in figure 2, item 1 that the set of information comprises an identification number, name, birth date, and blood type (physical attribute).

Regarding claim 4:

Chow et al. discloses the two-dimensional symbology comprises a 2-D barcode (figure 2, column 3 lines 1-2).

Regarding claims 6 and 7:

Chow et al., Chen et al. and Xu et al. disclose the identification document of claim 1. The use of certificates with public/private key pairs is inherent in the art. Additionally, the certificate comprising a public key for decrypting is also inherent in the art.

Regarding claims 10 and 11:

Chow et al. discloses the cryptographic measure comprises a hash of at least the first set of information and a second set of information (item 1 and 2, column 3 lines 43-51). The hash is later encrypted by the private key (column 5 lines 1-6).

Regarding claim 12:

Chow et al. discloses the second set of information comprises a condensed representation of the photographic representation (column 5 lines 65-66).

Regarding claim 13:

Chow et al. discloses in figure 2, item 1 an identification number (an identification number is unique to the ID and therefor can be used as an inventory number, where it is located). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to move the

identification number from section 1 to section 2 using either an overlay or a displaying the ID number at a side of the picture.

Regarding claim 14:

Chow et al. discloses the indicia comprises at least text but not a barcode (figure 2). Examiner takes official notice that barcodes are well known in the art. The claim would have been obvious because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al., Chen et al. and Xu et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Manabe (US 2002/0073319).

Chow et al., Chen et al. and Xu et al. disclose the identification document of claim 6, but do not disclose wherein the cryptographic measure comprises an encrypted form to at least a first private key and second private key, wherein the first private key is uniquely associated with a fabrication equipment operator or a first stage of fabrication, and the second private key is uniquely associated with equipment used in fabricating the identification document or a second stage of fabrication. Manabe discloses inserting discrimination information for a printing person or a printing controller system (paragraph 69). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to associate the private keys of Chow et al., Chen et al. and Xu et al. with the discrimination information of Manabe in order to include information such as the printing person, printing controller system, ID of the printer, and/or time information

(paragraph 69). The hash function of Chow can be applied to each item individually in order to obtain a first digital signature corresponding to a first stage of document fabrication and a second digital signature corresponding to a second stage of the document fabrication process. The claim would have been obvious because "a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense."

Claims 15-20 and 22-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al. in view of Manabe and Xu et al.

Regarding claims 15, 18, 19, and 26:

Chow et al. discloses a method of analyzing an identification document, the identification document comprising a first set of information and a cryptographic signature corresponding to the first set of information, wherein the first set of information and the cryptographic signature are encoded in a machine-readable format, the encoding being printed or engraved on a surface of the identification document, said method comprising: machine-sensing the first set of information and the cryptographic signature (column 5 lines 9-30, the use of certificates is inherent in public/private key pair methods; It is common to sign a document with the creator's/manufacture's signature in order to identify authenticity of the document and verify it is a trusted origin). Chow et al. does not disclose determining construction materials, equipment, or processing details of the identification document from at least the cryptographic signature. Manabe discloses inserting discrimination information for a printing person or

a printing controller system (paragraph 69). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to associate the cryptographic signature of Chow et al. with the discrimination information of Manabe in order to include information such as the printing person, printing controller system, ID of the printer, and/or time information (paragraph 69).

Chow et al. and Manabe do not disclose that the first set of information or the cryptographic measure are contained in the encoded symbology. Xu et al. discloses that a two-dimensional barcode (encoded symbology) can embed a variety of data such as a signature, an identification code, a URL, encrypted or unencrypted data, and a logo and other graphics [column 3 lines 27-49]. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Regarding claims 16 and 17:

Chow et al. discloses digital watermarking in the form of a two-dimensional symbology (figure 2, item 3).

Regarding claim 20:

Chow et al., Manabe, and Xu et al. disclose the method of claim 19, but does not disclose the method of determining whether the certificate has been revoked. Examiner takes official notice that certificate revocation was well known within the art at the time of invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to check a

trusted third party to find out the authenticity and status of the certificate (if the certificate is revoked or not).

Regarding claims 22 and 23:

Chow et al., Manabe, and Xu et al. disclose the method of claim 18 and the use of asymmetric keys (column 5 lines 1-6), but does not disclose the use of symmetric keys or the use of a trusted third party. Examiner takes official notice that trusted third parties were well known at the time of invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to check the authenticity and status of the certificate with a trusted third party in order to guarantee authenticity of the signature. Examiner takes official notice that symmetric keys were well known in the art at the time of invention. The claim would have been obvious because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Regarding claim 24:

Chow et al., Manabe, and Xu et al. disclose the method of claim 18, wherein the fabrication details comprise at least one of an identification document distribution record, unauthorized issuance, type of identification document equipment used to fabricate the document, document assembling equipment operator, document lot number or document batch number (Manabe, paragraph 69, printing person, printing controller system, ID of the printer, and/or time information).

Regarding claim 25:

Chow et al., Manabe, and Xu et al. disclose the method of claim 18 wherein the fabrication details include printing person, printing controller, ID of the printer, and/or time information (Manabe, paragraph 69), but do not disclose wherein the fabrication details comprise at least a type of identification document. The claims would have been obvious because "a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense."

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al. in view of Manabe, Xu et al. and How Certificate Services Works.

Regarding claim 21:

Chow et al. discloses a method of analyzing an identification document, the identification document a security feature printed or engraved on a surface of the identification document in a two-dimensional encoded symbology, the identification document further comprising a first set of information and a cryptographic signature corresponding to the first set of information, wherein the first set of information and the cryptographic signature are encoded in a machine-readable format, the encoding being printed or engraved on a surface of the identification document, said method comprising: machine-sensing the first set of information and the cryptographic signature (column 5 lines 9-30, the use of certificates is inherent in public/private key pair methods; It is common to sign a document with the creator's/manufacture's signature in order to identify authenticity of the document and verify it is a trusted origin). Chow et al. does not disclose determining construction materials, equipment, or processing details

of the identification document from at least the cryptographic signature. Manabe discloses inserting discrimination information for a printing person or a printing controller system (paragraph 69). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to associate the cryptographic signature of Chow et al. and Chen et al. with the discrimination information of Manabe in order to include information such as the printing person, printing controller system, ID of the printer, and/or time information (paragraph 69). Chow et al. and Manabe do not disclose, wherein said cryptographic signature comprises a date indicator, and wherein said determining comprises determining whether the date indicator corresponds with an untrusted –but not expired – date. How Certificate Services Works discloses a status for certificates, CertificateHold, that is a temporary revocation that indicates that a CA will not vouch for a certificate at a specific point in time (page 33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Chow and Manabe with the CertificateHold status of How Certificate Services Works in order to allow for temporary revocation (page 33).

Chow et al., How Certificates Work and Manabe do not disclose that both are contained in the encoded symbology. Xu et al. discloses that a two-dimensional barcode (encoded symbology) can embed a variety of data such as a signature, an identification code, a URL, encrypted or unencrypted data, and a logo and other graphics [column 3 lines 27-49]. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the

combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow et al. in view of How Certificate Services Works and Xu et al.

Chow et al. discloses a method of identifying unauthorized issuance of an identification document, wherein unauthorized issuance occurs when the identification document is fabricated on authorized equipment but is issued in an unauthorized manner, the identification document comprising a security feature printed or engraved on a surface of the identification document in a two-dimensional encoded symbology, the identification document further including first data and a digital signature corresponding to at least the first data, the digital signature further including a date indicator associated with the fabrication of the identification document, said method comprising machine-sensing the identification document to obtain the first data and the digital signature (figure 1, scanner scans the identification document); validating the digital signature in accordance with a certificate associated with the digital signature (column 5 lines 9-30, the use of certificates is inherent in public/private key pair methods; It is common to sign a document with the creator's/manufacture's signature in order to identify authenticity of the document and verify it is a trusted origin).

Chow et al. does not disclose determining whether the certificate has been revoked, and if so revoked, determining whether the date indicator corresponds with a date associated with the certificate's revocation, and if so associated, identifying the identification document as being issued without authority. How Certificate Services

Works discloses a status for certificates, CertificateHold, which is a temporary revocation that indicates that a CA will not vouch for a certificate at a specific point in time (page 33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Chow et al. with the CertificateHold status of How Certificate Services Works in order to allow for temporary revocation (page 33).

Chow et al. and How Certificates Work do not disclose that both are being contained in the encoded symbology. Xu et al. discloses that a two-dimensional barcode (encoded symbology) can embed a variety of data such as a signature, an identification code, a URL, encrypted or unencrypted data, and a logo and other graphics [column 3 lines 27-49]. All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES TURCHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWRF 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571)272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christian LaForgia/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439

Application/Control Number: 10/734,614

Page 15

Art Unit: 2439

JRT